

ILLINOIS ENGLISH BULLETIN

Official Publication of the Illinois Association of Teachers of English

Vol. 44, No. 3

Urbana, Illinois

December, 1956

Published every month except June, July, August, and September. Subscription price, \$2.00 per year; single copies, 25 cents. *Entered as second-class matter October 29, 1941, at the post office at Urbana, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.* Editor, J. N. Hook, University of Illinois. Co-editor, Wilmer Lamar, Decatur Senior High School. Editorial communications may be addressed to J. N. Hook, 121 Lincoln Hall, Urbana, Illinois. Orders and other business communications may be addressed to Harris Wilson, 204-A Lincoln Hall, Urbana, Illinois.

Why Don't We Teach More Creative Writing?

By ROXANE RIVA*
CHICAGO

Why can't we teach more creative writing? Because, I believe, we don't care to—we don't believe it is important enough to warrant the energy so precious to today's overloaded English teacher.

Emphasis in high schools today is upon the practical, the functional, the "preparation for life." English is a tool subject, striving:

"to direct pupils' oral and written speech, used primarily for practical and social ends, so that gradually it shall become a conscious tool of conveying knowledge and assisting thought."
... (Dewey, in "How We Think")

Communication! Language Arts! And so goes the hue and cry. Certainly functionalism is a valid and perhaps long-neglected approach to high school teaching in general. I would be the last one to deny the importance—and the difficulty—of effective communication; I believe that lack of communication is perhaps the most important contributing element in personal unhappiness and universal strife today. But there is more than one kind of communication.

Few English teachers will deny the powers of literature for developing in young people sensitivity, appreciation of beauty, consciousness of universalities. But of these same teachers, how many fail to see these same values—and many more—in student creative writing! Why?

* Mrs. Riva, who taught last year in Chatsworth High School, now teaches freshmen at the University of Illinois.

Society today, the American society especially, is highly materialistic, acquisitive, competitive. "Get ahead" is whispered to us by our parents and screamed at us by advertising. Get rich quick—or do your very best to make your neighbors think you have done so—credit—buy—*possessions*—herein, we are told, lies success.

With this over-materialistic perspective it is not surprising to find the idealistic artist shunned as "bohemian," strange (Heavens! he doesn't conform), not quite manly, and art ignored as frivolous, useless, something divorced from life. Society tends to "look upon the activity of the artist as something very remote from ourselves and our lives," Caudwell (p. 151) tells us. I shall never forget the shock I experienced upon hearing my father, a professional artist (painter, now doing commercial art), condemn my voracious reading of poetry as contributing to my unrealistic perspective upon life!

We fail to make this very important distinction between the idealist and the psychotic: the idealist attempts to lessen the disparity between life and what it should be; the psychotic is incapable of perceiving the disparity.

It is this same materialism which is pervading the schools. In the universities it is most noticeable in the increase of enrollment in engineering, agriculture, and commerce, while enrollment in "the arts" seldom increases proportionately. In the high schools and elementary schools we see its unfortunate effects in dogmatic and utterly unjustified interpretations of the philosophy of John Dewey. We "educate for democracy," we "prepare for life," we teach functional *skills*, and forget about the attitudes and principles and ideals that are the basic elements of democracy and personal happiness:

"The complete freedom necessary for the life of the creative spirit has always stood opposed to the methodical acquisition of English skills and techniques. . . . Correctness has appeared the antithesis of spontaneity." (Mirrieles, p. 183)

"How blindly do we insist more and more upon reason and fact and technical proficiency, when within easy reach lies an almost untried remedy—the educative and ennobling power of the arts." (Caudwell, p. 181)

It is in the area of composition most especially that we are guilty of this impractical "practicality," this justification of materialism. We fail to recognize the dual purpose of writing—artistic self-expression as well as communication of functional ideas. *The English Language Arts*, a report by the National Council of Teachers of English Committee on the English Curriculum, notes among areas

which deserve more emphasis, "abundant opportunities for creative writing."

"But we *are* teaching creative writing!" militantly exclaim the English teachers. Yes, we are. Well, some of us are.

When I was in high school, a few short years ago, we didn't. Not, at least, at the high school I attended. It is with the deepest regret that I look back on my high school attempts at creative writing; I was one of the few that "naturally" burned with the urge to write. My fumbling attempts were enthusiastically received by the teacher and by the class to whom she read them, as were those of a few other "inspired" souls. They were duly recorded as "extra credit," and returned, with enthusiastic, supposedly encouraging, but highly generalized and vague criticism. One teacher was concerned enough to suggest I submit one of my pieces to *Seventeen* magazine—after, of course, due editing; in abject fear of the high standards of such a great magazine, I never found courage to do so. But there was no such thing as organized instruction in writing of the creative sort—I never had guidance in evaluating the caliber and promise of my work.

A group of us even went so far as to organize and put out a little "newspaper," filled with the usual gossip, much whimsy and satire on school and the world situation, and our serious attempts at expression. This lasted for almost a year, finally dying a sad death (we held official funeral services in the school cafeteria) when we overstepped the bounds of propriety by naming a character in one of our myths after one of the more prominent and more feared of our school advisers.

All this activity, however, was on our own. The school (of 1,600 students) had no creative writing club, the official school newspaper was far too much grounded in prosaic reality and factuality for our soaring spirits, and after the failure of the *Mystic Bulletin*, we went our own ways, concentrating our creative efforts upon Choir, Orchestra, and Band.

Incidents like this, I am sure, are not infrequent. And they are, I feel, inexcusable. We were the insuppressibles—the few with the drive and nerve to instigate projects by ourselves. But how many more were there who didn't just happen upon congenial company, or were squelched by the popular ethic of poetry and creative writing as sissy?

It was during my practice teaching that the full implications of this lack in my high school training became apparent to me. As I sat in on the Morton Writers' Club, watching the enthusiastic exchange of writings and criticism between young people, hearing

the unpedantic ease with which they discussed meter and climax, all the essentials I learned only in literature study in college, sensing the warmth of the group spirit, the contagion of enthusiasm for writing—all this guided, grounded, channeled and appreciated by the ministering angel (my critic-teacher), Miss Marjorie Diez, I felt a sense of profound regret for these opportunities I had been denied. Who knows but I might have written sheaves of stories and poems, instead of scraps of paper with scribbled ideas, the abandoned attempts in the single folder I had self-consciously labeled "Attempts at Writing"?

In a cooler mood I had time to turn from my visions of glory to a consideration of my experience as a representative of young people of today. Whether or not any of these young people achieve success as writers is not of major importance. The important issue is that sufficient opportunities are being denied to too many young people today.

Permit me to cite one more experience from my scarlet past and present which demonstrates the great need for the teaching of creative writing. A young man whom I know, after finding himself unable to qualify for his lifetime dream of becoming a doctor, has emerged from the deep unhappiness of his frustration with a romantic determination to become a writer. After studiously adopting what he considers all the appropriate bohemian eccentricities in speech and clothing and submerging himself in the arty crowd at the University, he is now struggling—and I mean struggling—to write. What I have seen of his writing is not good, and (I believe my long acquaintance with him qualifies me to say) serves the purpose of emotional catharsis, and little else. I do not deny the utility of creative writing as catharsis—this is perhaps one of its most commendable values—but it is certainly insufficient as the sole foundation upon which to build a career as a writer, especially in a society as basically antagonistic to "new art" as is ours.

This young man is headed for a far deeper fall than the first—but if, by some magnificent chance I am mistaken in my diagnosis (as I have often deeply wished to be), how many others like him could be prevented from wasting their time and money and dreams chasing a false illusion of their "talents," or of the ease of writing as a career if, early in their studies, they could have sufficient guidance and practice to permit them to become acquainted with the demands of writing, to develop a realistic conception of their potential for success in writing?

Certainly these examples are evidence of the importance of early guidance and encouragement of creative writing in helping young people to try their wings, to realize their limitations or potential in writing. But I have been limiting my discussion to the complete neglect of creative writing instruction in the high school. In all fairness this serious inadequacy is rather the exception than the rule. Most high schools today have a creative writing club, and many have a special class in creative writing for the more talented and/or interested. This is an important step in the right direction. But this is not enough. Which brings us, once again, to our conception of the worth of creative writing.

There is a prevalent myth that creative writing is a luxurious frivolity, a leisure pastime, permitted when scholastic requirements have been satisfied, and then in these special classes for the "talented" or "interested." What is talent in creative writing? How does one become interested? My interest was a function of pure chance; from extensive reading my love of literature combined with my overactive imagination to explode into a compulsive urge. It is a delicate combination of home atmosphere and personality traits that creates the explosive writer. And this explosion is by no mean necessarily coupled with this ineffable talent. How then, do we great defenders of equality of opportunity justify denying the opportunity for creative writing to the majority of young people?

"But not everyone can write this way," we say. "Why force a student to insincere and weak expressions of his lack of creativity?" "You can't squeeze an empty bag!" "And pity us, the poor teachers, forced to read these feeble attempts, after we have been nurtured on Milton and Chaucer!" (And I fear that the last plea may have greater bearing on our neglect than we are willing to admit.) That some students, ultimately, have *more* potential for creative expression is undeniable; that some have *none* is ridiculous! From all sources we have evidence to the contrary:

"Artistic activity is a general attribute of the human mind."
(Gustave Britsch, quoted in Schaefer-Simmern, p. xi)

"All men under the stimulus of . . . emotion . . . become poets in some very small degree because it is by these feelings that they are moved to express themselves most imaginatively."
(Caudwell, p. 8)

"Only one in a thousand is a poet; yet 900 in a thousand should try to write poetry." (P. Lyon, in Hartman and Schumaker, p. 187)

This, naturally brings up the ever-present problem of motivation, the uninterested or sophisticated student. But it is less of a problem than it seems. "In no class is there a student who is without desire for self-expression," says Robinson. Here, then, is the *purpose* in activity; it remains only for the teacher to be alert to the many opportunities which arise to relate this desire for communication to a specific expression, and, perhaps most important of all, to establish an atmosphere of constructive encouragement, freedom, friendliness, and student-teacher respect, in which these expressions may come naturally.

A discussion of teaching methods in creative writing, certainly germane at this point, is literally impossible because of the wealth of ideas and of controversy entailed. I have, therefore, limited myself to my attempts to prove that motivation is not a twelve-headed monster we must slay before we can teach creative writing to all students. "The desire for writing grows with writing," said Erasmus, and my personal experience has proved it so. A project in play-writing with my students in freshman remedial reading, greeted at the outset with grumbles and groans and even an obstinate "I will not!" was all they could talk about a few days later, and even my ultra-sophisticated juniors showed amazing enthusiasm, as well as ingenuity and perceptivity, in their individual treatments of a general story outline we had composed in class.

And so it would seem that everyone can do some kind of creative writing, and that the great majority of students can be motivated to enthusiasm for it. But of what value is this practice?

Creative writing embodies goals paramount to the educational pragmatist as well as those semi-intangibles we idealists consider so important, such as some of the goals of the Language Arts Program as stated in *The English Language Arts*: "Wholesome Personal Development," "Dynamic and Worthwhile Allegiances through Heightened Moral Perception and a Personal Sense of Values," "Growing Personal Interests and Increasingly Mature Standards of Enjoyment," and finally, "Social Sensitivity and Effective Participation in the Group Life."

What "wholesome personal development" can creative writing provide? First, and perhaps most obvious, is that of increased sensitivity. Caudwell notes repeatedly the wealth of poetic lyrics written by artists in their youth, and any text of educational psychology notes the extreme emotionality of adolescence. This is the time for great heights and depths of emotion; creative writing can bring them out from under the sophisticated stoicism dictated by the prevailing adolescent ethic.

"There is no creative writing without creative living through the senses," says L. Hood (Hartman and Schumaker, p. 183). Creative writing texts are filled with exercises for development of sensory acuity; authors and critics note the necessity of sensitivity to successful creative writing:

"The author does not only write when he is at his desk; he writes all day long, when he is thinking, when he is reading, when he is experiencing; everything he sees and feels is significant to his purpose, and, consciously or unconsciously, he is forever storing and making over his impressions." (Maugham, p. 111)

After sufficient practice in writing and in the evaluation of the writing of their classmates, students will realize the importance of sensitivity in the search for subject matter as well, of the deep satisfaction than can be gained from the expression even of W. D. Howells' "commonplace." As Caudwell tells us:

"It is not the majestic movements only, or indeed principally, that have moved poets to write, but chance encounters and brief moods: a bird's song, or a fall of snow."

Indeed, the sensitivity encouraged by creative writing may lead young people to a discovery far too few adults realize:

"The things that satisfy are simple things—delight in human nature, love and friendship, pride in his work and a life in contact with nature so that he can see the processes of nature and love them." (Caudwell, p. 10)

And creative writing holds far greater personal satisfaction. It holds, I think, an answer to one of the most pressing problems in education (and in our culture) today, that of individual identity. "The art of life," Powys tells us, "consists in creating an individual and a unique self." Sherwood Anderson and Sinclair Lewis have dramatically demonstrated a basic weakness of democracy, aggravated in America by the materialism I mentioned earlier—its tendency to "level all men alike," stamp them in a uniform mold:

"Convention, tribal taboos, mechanistic living, long years of schooling—something has stilled the spirit within or walled it securely." (Mearns, in Hartman and Schumaker, p. 13)

This problem is further aggravated in the adolescent who is struggling with his self-concept for other reasons as well. Often caught on the fence between childhood and maturity, precariously

veering back and forth from one to the other (with the accompanying shifts in perspective), he is trying to establish his identity in a new role in the world of adults—which, we must admit, is pretty much chaos, anyway.

The feeling of achievement which comes from creativity of any sort is a great builder of self-confidence:

“To create something which you have thought out yourself and worked upon until it is finished as nearly right as you can make it, gives a kind of deep satisfaction to anyone, young or old.”
(Robinson, p. 2)

And John Dewey notes the

“gain in the strength of stature, in the belief in his own powers, and the self-respect, which make any artistic activity constructive in the growth of personality.”

And yet the introspection, the acute perceptivity necessitated by writing prevents this confidence from souring into smug complacency. It was no less a person than John Stuart Mill who said:

“Art . . . trains us never to be completely satisfied with imperfection in what we ourselves do and are: to idealize, as much as possible, every work we do, and most of all, our characters and lives.”

Thus, through deepening of sensitivity to all aspects of life, through a sense of personal achievement and confidence, creative writing encourages the “wholesome personal development” which is the first goal of the English program.

What about moral perception? Sparing you detailed quotations from the many philosophers and aesthetic critics who assert the moral function of art, I believe we all recognize the two most basic purposes of any artist, and certainly of the writer, as expression of the truth, and the attempt for the fullest and most perfect expression of this truth. What English teacher would deny the deep power of literature which combines rational, emotional, and spiritual appeal to express basic truths of humanity?

This “moral” power of art was vividly demonstrated to me during my practice teaching. A class discussion, engendered by the reading of Crèvecoeur’s “This is America,” terminated in violent controversy, two lonely students and myself attempting to defend the Negro to a bitterly anti-Negro class. It was obvious after five minutes that reasoning with them was completely unsuccessful, so I postponed further discussion until the next day when I read three carefully chosen poems by Negroes expressing the frustration and

pain the Negro encounters simply and only because he is a Negro. The silence after I finished was, I think, one of the most beautiful I have ever experienced, and the looks of sympathy on my students' faces were ones I will long remember. I asked for further discussion—there was none. The emotional-rational combination had communicated very deeply where the rational alone had failed completely.

Why, then, deny the same power to student creative writing? Here, actually, the moral value may be far deeper, because the process of communication necessitates acute sensitivity to all aspects of the experience, repeated re-living of it, and deep and careful analysis of it.

One of the more prevalent criticisms of creative writing is its inferiority to so-called functional writing in the development of intellectual curiosity and the capacity for critical thinking. This criticism could be justified only by defining creative writing as a direct, simple, effortless, and cathartic outpouring, which it never can be! "The work of art . . . cannot be produced by a mind relaxed," said Benedetto Croce. "All art is interpretation of experience, criticism of life, the reaction of man to his environment," says Caudwell (p. 55), and later, (p. 108) he notes the cause of this misconception of the nature of artistic creativity:

"Because so many phrases have been coined to the effect that art imitates nature, or holds the mirror up to nature, there is the danger of overlooking the elaborate processes of selection, adjustment, and re-organization that go on before the work of art is produced."

No matter how emotional the experience which motivates the writing, the communication of that experience requires intellectual curiosity and critical thinking of the most acute nature—both in interpretation and evaluation of the experience itself:

"While I agree that creative inspiration is unteachable, I insist that ideas are the beginning and end, the instigation and product of fiction, not the act of writing it, or even its material." (Wheeler, p. 450)

"It is in high school, however, that we begin to find the real outpourings of youth, confronted with all the burning questions of life and death, love and war, in their first seriousness." (Morse, p. 220)

—and in the constant attempt to express it, technically, and artistically, in the very best way possible. By the very nature of his enthusiasm, his desire for perfect expression, the writer will search

carefully, change, weigh, and inductively develop standards of judging ideas and their expression:

"There is so great a distance between what [the author] saw in his mind's eye and the best he has been able to do that for him the result is no more than a makeshift." (Maugham, p. 115)

Creative writing provides as many opportunities for intellectual and critical growth as does functional writing—and more, because the student has here to contend with the subtleties of both emotionality and rationality and their blending.

Progress toward the fourth goal, effective use of language, is a natural outgrowth of the writer's attempt at the best possible expression. What could be a more utilitarian, functional, well-motivated situation for vocabulary interest than the writer's search for the exact word? Here, as well, is excellent opportunity for students to learn to differentiate between factual and emotional language, extensional and intensional meaning, and among the various levels of abstraction.

As for growth in personal interests and development of mature standards of judgment, we can easily see how broadening of interests is a natural consequence of the intellectual curiosity and the emotional and aesthetic sensitivity earlier discussed as vital to the creative process. Equally obvious is the high correlation between constant literary-aesthetic evaluation of one's own writing and evaluation of literature in general:

"Exposure to fine literature contributes immensely to a richer, more adequate expression. Conversely, the effort of trying to write one's own ideas effectively and colorfully heightens sensitivity to good literature." (Mirrieles, p. 188)

"Only great labor to write can impress students with the achievement of the great." (P. Lyon, in Hartman and Schumaker, p. 187)

What could be a better background for the understanding of the written communication of others than one's own attempt, however feeble, at communication?

Finally, social sensitivity is as vital to the creative process as the emotional and sensory sensitivity mentioned earlier. The writer's keen observation of the world around him is of necessity directed upon mankind as well as upon nature and his emotional and intellectual reactions to it. Character portrayal, even effective personal communication, requires not only an understanding of people and how they tick, but empathy, Keats' "negative capa-

bility"—the ability of the writer to forget himself and project into all types of people, to see and think and react as they do—if he is to portray characters with consistency and emphasize the universality of human experience.

Furthermore, creative writing is by its very nature a supremely social experience—it is communication of the deepest sort—a sharing of joy, unhappiness, truth, an expression of the basic human craving for sympathy and understanding and company, an attempt to alleviate the deep inherent loneliness of the human condition that prompted Thomas Wolfe to mourn, "What man has ever really known another?"

The teaching of creative writing to *every* high school student, then, offers unbelievably rich and varied rewards. It can aid budding writers in an estimation of their ability and discover the hidden, shy, but talented few. But, more important, creative writing will develop in all young people, "talented" or not, deeper sensory and emotional perceptivity in communication and all areas of living, the ability to think both critically and constructively, not only in terms of literary excellence, but philosophically, and greater self-confidence and a deeper understanding and appreciation of mankind. Furthermore, it will permit them the joy of creation they so frequently miss in a predominately anti-aesthetic, materialist society.

Why, then, don't we teach more creative writing? Why, indeed!

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Caudwell, H. *The Creative Impulse in Writing and Painting*. London: The Macmillan Co., 1951.

Hartman and Schumaker, eds. *Creative Expression; the Development of Children in Art, Music, Literature and Dramatics*. P.E.A. New York: The John Day Co., 1932.

Maugham, S. *The Summing Up*. London: Doubleday & Co., 1938.

Mirrielees, L. *Teaching Composition and Literature in Junior and Senior High School*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & Co., 1943.

National Council of Teachers of English Commission on the English Curriculum. *The English Language Arts*. New York: Appleton-Century, 1952.

Redford, G. H. "Of Teachers, Students, and 'Creative Writing,'" *English Journal*, 42 (1953) 490-6.

Robinson, M. L. and Hull, H. *Creative Writing—the Story Form*. New York: American Book Co., 1932.

Schaefer-Simmern, H. *The Unfolding of Artistic Activity—Its Basis, Processes, and Implications*. Berkeley: U. of Calif. Press, 1948.

Sutton-Smith, B. "Creative Writing: Writing What You Like and Liking What You Write," *Elementary English*, 30 (1953) 492-9.

Treut, Ferebee, Jackson, Saunders. *They All Want to Write*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1939.

Wheeler, J. "If I Taught Creative Writing," *College English*, 15 (1954) 449-54.

The English Language Arts in the Secondary School

More than five years in the making, the third volume in the NCTE curriculum series is now off the press and should prove of major interest and value to teachers of English in the junior and senior high schools.

The first volume in the series, *The English Language Arts*, appeared in 1952 and presented an over-all philosophy of English teaching, kindergarten through graduate school, with emphasis upon curriculum reconstruction. Volume Two, *Language Arts for Today's Children*, published in 1954, is being used in thousands of elementary schools as a guide to teaching and curriculum planning. The fourth volume, with 1958 as the probable target date, will concern the teaching of English in college, and the last book in the series will deal with the preparation of teachers of English.

The Commission on the English Curriculum, and especially Chairman Dora V. Smith and the editor of the third volume, Angela M. Broening, deserve the heartfelt congratulations and thanks of high school English teachers. The Commission has dared to produce a book that does not dodge controversial issues and yet does not take extreme positions. The writers, working as a team, have made use of the latest research, have weighed it, and have achieved a sensible blend of the best practices of the past and the best of the present.

The 488-page book is alive with specifics. Teachers who feel uncertain about unit planning, for example, will find a 42-page illustration of a successful unit, including materials, procedures, and rationale; even though no teacher may want to take over this entire unit, each will be interested in seeing how reading, writing, speaking, and listening may be incorporated. Examples of other successful teaching strategies and tactics have been drawn from all sections of the country. Carefully selected bibliographies add to the value of each chapter. Thirty-two pages of black and white illustrations are included, under the heading "What Teen-Agers Are Like—A Picture Story."

The volume begins with two chapters on "The World the Adolescent Faces" and "The Adolescent the Teacher Faces." Then come separate chapters on designing the program, building units, literature, reading, speaking, listening, writing, grammar and usage and spelling, making communication arts and skills reinforce each other, and meeting college entrance requirements.

Perhaps many teachers will turn first to Chapter 10, on that ever-controversial and usually misunderstood subject, grammar. This chapter opens with a discussion of the ambiguity of the word *grammar* and proceeds next to the importance of teaching the facts of *American English*. Here the authors discuss the weakness of conventional methods of classification, without taking the viewpoint that such methods should be abandoned and replaced by the newer classifications that are still being developed; the important thing, the authors believe, is that students be taught truths about language instead of the lies that they have been told unintentionally for so many years. A section on "Basic Considerations in Developing a Program in Grammar" discusses timing in relation to growth and need, and praises inductive teaching of grammatical concepts. Another section, on "Elements Requiring Instruction," is likely to arouse intense discussion, as is a section on "Problems of Teaching Method." Not everyone will agree with every conclusion, but the Commission should be commended for meeting such difficult questions head-on. Certainly one result will be to reduce the amount of muddled thinking on the part of teachers, administrators, and parents.

Five years is a long time to wait for a book, but the product proves that the time was not wasted.

The English Language Arts in the Secondary School. The National Council of Teachers of English, 704 South Sixth Street, Champaign, Illinois. Price \$4.00; \$2.60 to members of the Council.

Best Poetry and Prose

This year the March and April issues of the *Bulletin* will be devoted to some of the best poetry and prose written by students in Illinois junior and senior high schools. The poetry will once more be chosen by Miss Paulene Yates; the prose this time will be selected by members of the English Department at Evanston Township High School.

In an attempt to encourage teachers to submit more writing by students in grades 7 to 10, the editors of the two issues promise to print a larger proportion of such writing than in former years—if you send it in. The eventual goal is to devote about one-third of the space to the writing of students in junior high schools.

Please note these instructions:

1. Any Illinois member of I.A.T.E. is eligible to submit manuscripts.

2. Each teacher should submit no more than five pieces of prose or ten poems. Typed copy is preferred but not essential.

3. The title should be at the top of the first page of each selection. This year the student's class should be indicated as Seventh Grade, Eighth Grade, Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior. At the bottom of the last page should appear the following information, in exactly this form:

JANET JONES, Freshman, Exville H. S.
Helen Jackson, teacher

4. If possible, manuscripts should be submitted by December 20. The final deadline for poetry is January 15; for prose, February 15.

5. Send *poetry* manuscripts to Miss Paulene Yates, 304 Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Illinois.

6. Send *prose* manuscripts to Mr. Clarence Hach, Evanston Township High School, Evanston, Illinois.

7. Send booklets containing both poetry and prose to both Miss Yates and Mr. Hach.

8. With each group of manuscripts enclose a statement to this effect: "To the best of my knowledge these selections are original." In the final screening, Miss Yates and Mr. Hach may ask you to double check the originality of certain pieces.

9. Postal regulations require that manuscripts be mailed first class. If you wish unused manuscripts returned, please enclose a self-addressed envelope with first class postage.

10. A free copy of the *Bulletin* will be sent in your care to each student whose work is printed.

INDIANA COLLEGE TEACHERS SECOND

I. A. T. E. RESOLUTIONS

College teachers of English, meeting at Taylor University, Upland, Indiana, May 12, voted approval of the following resolutions: We, the Indiana College English Association, in order that we may recommend that more English majors consider high-school teaching as a career *and* in order to bring about improvement in the high-school English program in Indiana, endorse the action of the discussion group on "The Teaching of Grammar and Composition to College- and Non-College-Bound Students" at the City Teachers' Conference at Lafayette, Indiana, on February 4, 1956, in passing a resolution to recommend that Indiana superintendents of schools and principals of high schools seriously consider reducing the teaching load of English teachers to four classes of not more than twenty-five students each, and returning to the requirements of four years of English for college-bound students.

We furthermore endorse the action of The Illinois Association of Teachers of English at their meeting at Urbana, Illinois, on October 29, 1954, in voting approval of the following principles:

that the primary job of the teacher of English is to teach all students to read and write so that each and every one of them may become an informed, thoughtful, and articulate member of our democratic society;

that the English program include a 50-50 proportion of literature and composition throughout the four years in all high schools of the state;

that more emphasis be placed on world literature, on propaganda analysis, on critical listening, on clear, effective expression;

that a minimum of one short written composition be required in *all* English classes every week; this will of course necessitate reducing the teaching load;

that the size of high-school English classes be kept as nearly as possible to a maximum of 25 students so that all students can be given more effective training in spoken and written English. (End of resolutions.)

We believe that a reduction of work-load for high-school English teachers would enable teachers to devote more time to the teaching of, and the correction of, written composition; and might materially improve the English used by high-school graduates.

Signed

FREDERICK BERGMANN
DePauw University
President; Indiana College English
Association

PALMER CZAMANSKE
Valparaiso University
Chairman, Resolutions Committee,
Indiana College English Association